arXiv:math/0503070v1 [math.PR] 4 Mar 2005

# EXAMPLES OF MODERATE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE FOR DIFFUSION PROCESSES

A. GUILLIN AND R. LIPTSER

Abstract. Taking into account some likeness of moderate deviations (MD) and central limit theorems (CLT), we develop an approach, which made a good showing in CLT, for MD analysis of a family

$$S^\kappa_t=\frac{1}{t^\kappa}\int_0^t H(X_s)ds,\ t\to\infty$$

for an ergodic diffusion process $X_t$ under $0.5<\kappa<1$ and appropriate $H$. We mean a decomposition with "corrector":

$$\frac{1}{t^\kappa}\int_0^t H(X_s)ds=\text{corrector}+\frac{1}{t^\kappa}\underbrace{M_t}_{\text{martingale}}.$$

and show that, as in the CLT analysis, the corrector is negligible but in the MD scale, and the main contribution in the MD brings the family "$\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M_t,\ t\to\infty$." Starting from Bayer and Freidlin, [2], and finishing by Wu's papers [29]-[33], in the MD study Laplace's transform dominates. In the paper, we replace the Laplace technique by one, admitting to give the conditions, providing the MD, in terms of "drift-diffusion" parameters and $H$. However, a verification of these conditions heavily depends on a specificity of a diffusion model. That is why the paper is named "Examples ...".

## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we study the moderate deviation principle (in short: MDP) for a family $(S^\kappa_t)_{t\to\infty}$, $\kappa\in\left(\frac12,1\right)$:

$$S^\kappa_t=\frac{1}{t^\kappa}\int_0^t H(X_s)ds,$$

where $X=(X_t)_{t\ge0}$ is an ergodic diffusion process ($X_t\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $d\ge1$) (with the unique invariant measure $\mu(dz)$, obeying the density $p(z)$ relative to Lebesgue measure over $\mathbb{R}^d$.

The function $H:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^q$ is assumed to be integrable relative to $\mu(dz)$ and has zero barycenter

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}H(z)p(z)dz=0. \tag{1.1}$$

We restrict ourselves by consideration of the strong (unique) solution of Itô's equation

$$dX_t=b(X_t)dt+\sigma(X_t)dW_t \tag{1.2}$$

generated by a standard vector-valued Wiener process $W=(W_t)_{t\ge0}$ and subject to a fixed initial point, $X_0=x$. We also include into the consideration a linear version of (1.2) (here $A,B$ are matrices):

$$dX_t=AX_tdt+BdW_t \tag{1.3}$$

---

*Date*: December 25, 2004.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F10, 60J27.

*Key words and phrases.* moderate deviations, Poisson equation, Puhalskii theorem, Langevin equation.

being popular in engineering.

In a nonlinear case, we use Veretennikov - Khasminskii's condition (see, [14] and [28]): for some positive numbers $r$, $C$ and $\alpha$, (here $\langle\langle\cdot\rangle\rangle$ denotes the inner product)

$$\langle\langle z, b(z)\rangle\rangle \le -r\|z\|^{1+\alpha}, \ \|z\| > C$$

and assume that the diffusion matrix $a(x) = \sigma\sigma^*(x)$ is nonsingular and bounded. In a linear case, proper assumptions are given in terms of the pair $(A, B)$:

1) eigenvalues of $A$ have negative real parts;
2) $(A, B)$ satisfies Kalman's controllability condition from [12],
   i.e. a singularity of $a(x) \equiv BB^*$ is permissible.

For the MDP analysis, we apply well known method employed for the central limit theorem (in short CLT) proof of a family

$$\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\int_0^t H(X_s)ds\Big)_{t\to\infty}$$

(see, e.g. Papanicolaou, Stroock and Varadhan [20], Ethier and Kurtz [7], Bhattacharya [3], Pardoux and Veretennikov [21], [22] and citations therein, see also Ch. 9, §3 in [16]) based on a decomposition with corrector:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\int_0^t H(X_s)ds = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\underbrace{[U(x) - U(X_t)]}_{\text{corrector}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\underbrace{M_t}_{\text{martingale}},$$

where

$$U(x) = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(y)P_x^{(t)}(dy)dt,$$

$P_x^{(t)}$ is the transition probability kernel of $X$, and $M_t$ is a continuous martingale with the variation process $\langle M\rangle_t$. In the above mentioned papers, the corrector is negligible in a sense

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}[U(x) - U(X_t)] \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{\text{prob.}} 0$$

and the main contribution to a limit distribution brings $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}M_t$. It is well known (see, e.g. Ch. 5 in [16]) the following implication: with nonnegative definite matrix

$$\frac{1}{t}\langle M\rangle_t \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{\text{prob.}} Q \Rightarrow Ee^{\langle\langle\lambda, \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}M_t\rangle\rangle} \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle\langle\lambda, Q\lambda\rangle\rangle}, \quad \forall\ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^q,$$

where

$$Q = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big[(P_z^{(t)}H)H^*(z) + (P_z^{(t)}H)^*H(z)\big]p(z)dzdt,$$

Summarizing these remarks, we may claim that the CLT holds provided that $U(x)$ and $Q$ exist and for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} P\big(|U(x) - U(X_t)| > \sqrt{t}\varepsilon\big) = 0$$
$$\lim_{t\to\infty} P\big(|\langle M\rangle_t - tQ| > t\varepsilon\big) = 0.$$

We develop the same method for MDP analysis. Replacing $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$ by $\frac{1}{t^\kappa}$, we keep the CLT framework with the same $U(x)$, $M_t$ and $Q$, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{t^\kappa}\int_0^t H(X_s)ds = \frac{1}{t^\kappa}\underbrace{[U(x) - U(X_t)]}_{\text{corrector}} + \frac{1}{t^\kappa}\underbrace{M_t}_{\text{martingale}}$$

and claim that (Theorem 2.1) the MDP holds, with the rate of speed

$$\varrho(t) = \frac{1}{t^{2\kappa-1}}$$

provided that $U(x)$ and $Q$ exist and for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(|U(x) - U(X_t)| > t^{\kappa}\varepsilon\big) = -\infty \\ &\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(|\langle M\rangle_t - tQ| > t\varepsilon\big) = -\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

A choice of $\varrho(t)$ is imposed by $\frac{1}{t^{\kappa}}$. As in the CLT proof, the corrector negligibility is required but exponentially fast with the rate of speed $\varrho(t)$. The main contribution in the MDP brings the family $\big(\frac{1}{t^{\kappa}} M_t\big)_{t\to\infty}$.

Most probably, Dembo, [5], was one of the first who introduced a condition of (1.4) (second) type. We found in Puhalskii, [25] (Theorem 2.3) and [24], [26] that, in our setting with nonsingular (!) matrix $Q$, (1.4) provides MDP for the family $\big(\frac{1}{t^{\kappa}} M_t\big)_{t\to\infty}$ with the rate of speed $\varrho(t)$ and the rate function

$$J(Y) = \frac{1}{2}\|Y\|^2_{Q^{-1}}, \ Y \in \mathbb{R}^q.$$

We prove in Theorem 2.1 that the same statement remains valid for a singular $Q$ too with the rate function

$$J(Y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\|Y\|^2_{Q^{\oplus}}, & Y = QQ^{\oplus}Y, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

where $Q^{\oplus}$ is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse matrix (see, Albert, [1]).

It would be noted that seeming simplicity of (1.4) is delusive with the exception of the eigenvalue gap case (in short EG, see Gong and Wu, [8]) for $P^{(t)}_x$ (a corresponding scenario can be found in [4]). Unfortunately, the EG fails for diffusion processes. For instance, under $P^{(t)}_x$ associated with Ornstein-Uhlenbeck's process

$$dX_t = -X_t dt + dW_t$$

having $\big(0, \frac{1}{2}\big)$-Gaussian invariant measure $\mu$, if EG were valid, then for bounded centered $H$

$$|P^{(t)}_x H| \le \text{cons.} e^{-\lambda t}, \ \forall\ t \ge 0, \ \exists\ \lambda > 0.$$

However, direct computations show that for $H(x) = \text{sign}(x)$ and sufficiently large $|x|$, we have $|P^{(t)}_x H| dt \le \upsilon(x) e^{-\lambda t}$ where $\upsilon(x)$ is a positive function, $\upsilon(x) < \infty$ over $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\upsilon(x) \to \infty$ with $|x| \to \infty$. The condition of this type: for any bounded and measurable $H$

$$|P^{(t)}_x H - \mu H| \le \upsilon(x) e^{-\lambda t}$$

describes the geometric ergodicity (see, Down, Meyn and Tweedie, [6] and citations therein). The geometric ergodicity is a helpful tool for the verification of $U(x)$ and $Q$ existence and even for the first part of (1.4) verification, although, a crude choice of $\upsilon(x)$, say $\upsilon(x) \asymp |x|^m, m > 2$, may to render this verification impossible (CLT analysis is not so sensitive to a choice of $\upsilon$). The second part of (1.4) verification is very sensitive to properties of $U$, owing to $\langle M\rangle_t = \int_0^t \nabla^* U(X_s)(a(X_s)\nabla U(X_s) ds$, so that, the geometric ergodicity framework is not a "foreground" tool. Following Pardoux and Veretennikov, [21], we combine a property of $H$ with a polynomial ergodicity $|P^{(t)}_x H - \mu H| \le \frac{\upsilon(x)}{(1+t)^{\gamma}}$, $\gamma > 1$ with $H$-depending $\upsilon$ admitting an effective verification of (1.4). In this connection, we mention here some result (see, Theorem A.1), in Appendix, interesting by itself, which is helpful in (1.4) verification. Let $X$ be a diffusion process with the generator $\mathscr{L}$ and $V(x)$ is Lyapunov's function belonging to the range of definition of $\mathscr{L}$. Then, $N_t = V(X_t) - V(x_0) - \int_0^t \mathscr{L}V(X_s) ds$ is a continuous martingale and denote by $\langle N\rangle_t$ its variation process. Assume:

$$\mathscr{L}V \le -cV^{\ell} + \mathfrak{c}, \ \exists\ q > 0 \text{ and } \langle N\rangle_t \le \int_0^t \mathbf{c}\big(1 + V^r(X_s)\big) ds, \ \exists\ r \le \ell.$$

Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large number $n$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(V(X_t) > t^{2\kappa}\varepsilon\big) = -\infty,$$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\int_0^t V^{\ell}(X_s)ds > tn\Big) = -\infty.$$

Our method of the MDP analysis differs from Wu [29] - [33] where the Laplace transform technique dominates, or Guillin [9], [10] based on discrete time approximation and Markov chains. In our approach, we deal with the above-mentioned Puhalskii's results obtained with the help of, so called, stochastic exponential as an alternative to Laplace's transform technique (see, e.g. [4] for more detailed explanation in the discrete time case).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, all notations are given and Theorem 2.1, generalized Puhalskii's for singular $Q$, is formulated and proved. In Section 3, all results and examples are presented focusing on the existence and properties of the corrector and martingale variation process. The proofs are gathered in Section 4. A simple example showing how the MDP may help in a statistical inference (for more information on statistical applications see, Inglot and Kallenberg, [11]) is given in Section 5. The technical tools are gathered in Appendix A.

## 2. Preliminaries

We fix the following notations and assumptions which are in force through the paper. The random process $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is defined on some stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbf{F} = (\mathscr{F}_t)_{t\geq}, P)$ satisfying the usual conditions.

- $\|\cdot\|$, $|\cdot|$, and $\langle\!\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\!\rangle$ are Euclidean's and $\mathbb{L}$ norms respectively in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and the inner product.
- $^*$ is transposition symbol.
- $a(z) := \sigma\sigma^*(z)$.
- $c, \mathfrak{c}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+, \ldots,$ are generic constants.
- $P_x^{(t)}(dy)$ is the transition probability kernel of $X$.
- $E_x$ denotes the expectation relative to $P_x^{(t)}(dy)$.
- $\mu(dz)$ is the invariant measure.
- $\mathscr{L} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}(z)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(z)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$ is the generator of $X$.
- $(\mathscr{F}_t^X)_{t\geq 0}$ is the filtration, with the general conditions, generated by $(X_t)$.
- $\langle L\rangle_t$ - is the variation process of a continuous martingale $(L_t)_{t\geq 0}$.
- $\nabla f(x)$ is the gradient of $f(x)$ (row vector).
- $\rho$ is Euclidean's metric in $\mathbb{R}^d$.
- $\varrho(t) = \frac{1}{t^{2\kappa-1}}$.
- I denotes the identical matrix of an appropriate size.
- "$>$", "$\geq$" denote also the standard inequalities for nonnegative definite matrices.

As was mentioned in Introduction, the existence of

$$Q = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big[(P_z^{(t)}H)H^*(z) + (P_z^{(t)}H)^*H(z)\Big] dtp(z)dz, \tag{2.1}$$

$$U(x) = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(y)P_x^{(t)}(dy)dt \tag{2.2}$$

is required. We emphasize that

$$M_t = U(X_t) - U(x) + \int_0^t H(X_s)ds$$

is the martingale relative to $(\mathscr{F}_t^X)_{t\geq 0}$.

The theorem below is a “master-key” for MDP analysis.

**Theorem 2.1.** *For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, assume*

(i) $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(|U(x) - U(X_t)| > t^\kappa \varepsilon\big) = -\infty$

(ii) $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(|\langle M\rangle_t - tQ| > t\varepsilon\big) = -\infty$

*Then, the family $(S_t^\kappa)_{t\to\infty}$ obeys the MDP in $(\mathbb{R}^q, \rho)$ with the rate of speed $\varrho(t)$ and the rate function*

$$J(Y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\|Y\|^2_{Q^\oplus}, & Y = QQ^\oplus Y, \\ \infty, & \textit{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

*where $Q^\oplus$ is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse matrix (see, Albert,* [1]*).*

*Proof.* From the definition of $M_t$, it follows that

$$S_t^\kappa = \frac{1}{t^\kappa}[U(x) - U(X_t)] + \frac{1}{t^\kappa} M_t.$$

(i) provides the negligibility of $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}[U(x) - U(X_t)]\big)_{t\to\infty}$ in $\varrho$-MDP scale.

(ii) provides $\varrho$-MDP, , under positive definite matrix, with the rate function

$$J(Y) = \frac{1}{2}\|Y\|^2_{Q^{-1}}$$

for the family $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M_t\big)_{t\to\infty}$ (due to result similar to Puhalskii, [25] (Theorem 2.3) and [26]).

If $Q$ is nonnegative definite only, the above result is no longer valid. This remark necessitates to turn to the general approach in large deviation analysis adapted to our setting. The family $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M_t\big)_{t\to\infty}$ is said to obey the large deviation principle (in our terminology: MDP) with the rate of speed $\varrho(t)$ and some (good) rate function $J(Y), Y \in \mathbb{R}^q$, provided that this family is $\varrho$-exponentially tight in $(\mathbb{R}^q, \rho)$:

$$\lim_{K\to\infty} \varlimsup_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M_t\Big| > K\Big) = -\infty \tag{2.4}$$

and obeys $(\varrho, J)$-local large deviation principle with the rate function $J(Y)$: for any $Y \in \mathbb{R}^q$

$$\begin{aligned} &\varlimsup_{\delta\to 0} \varlimsup_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M_t - Y\Big| \leq \delta\Big) \leq -J(Y) \\ &\varliminf_{\delta\to 0} \varliminf_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M_t - Y\Big| \leq \delta\Big) \geq -J(Y). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

A direct verification of (2.4) and (2.5) would be difficult. So, it is reasonable to verify (2.4) by applying the following regularization procedure. We introduce a new family $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M_t^\gamma\big)_{t\to\infty}$ with

$$M_t^\gamma = M_t + \sqrt{\gamma} dW_t',$$

where $\gamma$ is a positive number and $W_t'(\in \mathbb{R}^q)$ is a standard Wiener process independent of $M_t$. The random process $M_t^\gamma$ is continuous martingale with

$$\langle M^\gamma\rangle_t = \langle M\rangle_t + \gamma \mathrm{I}t,$$

where $\mathrm{I} = \mathrm{I}_{q\times q}$. For the family $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M_t^\gamma\big)_{t\to\infty}$, (ii) reads as:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{t}\langle M^\delta\rangle_t - Q_\gamma\Big| > \varepsilon\Big) = -\infty,$$

where $Q_\gamma = Q + \gamma \mathrm{I}$. Since $Q_\gamma$ is the nonsingular matrix, the family $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M^\gamma_t\big)_{t\to\infty}$ obeys $(\varrho, J_\gamma)$-MDP, where $J_\gamma(Y) = \frac{1}{2}\|Y\|^2_{Q^{-1}_\gamma}$.

Now, we apply the basic Puhalskii theorem from [23] which, being adapted to our case, states that the family $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M^\gamma_t\big)_{t\to\infty}$ is $\varrho(t)$-exponentially tight, in $(\mathbb{R}^q, \rho)$:

$$\varlimsup_{K\to\infty}\varlimsup_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M^\gamma_t\Big| > K\Big) = -\infty, \tag{2.6}$$

and obeys $(\varrho, J_\gamma)$-local deviation principle:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varlimsup_{\delta\to 0}\varlimsup_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M^\gamma_t - Y\Big| \le \delta\Big) \le -J_\gamma(Y)\\
&\varliminf_{\delta\to 0}\varliminf_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{t^\kappa}M^\gamma_t - Y\Big| \le \delta\Big) \ge -J_\gamma(Y).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Obviously, (2.6) and (2.7) imply (2.4) and (2.5) provided that

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\varlimsup_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)P\Big(\Big|\frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{t^\kappa}W'_t\Big| \ge \eta\Big) = -\infty, \quad \forall\, \eta > 0 \tag{2.8}$$

and

$$\lim_{\gamma\to 0}J_\gamma(V) = \begin{cases}\frac{1}{2}\|Y\|^2_{Q^\oplus}, & Q^\oplus QY = Y\\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

(2.8) holds true, since the family $\frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{t^\kappa}W'_t$ obeys the $\varrho$-MDP with the rate function $\frac{1}{2\gamma}\|Y\|^2$, so that,

$$\varlimsup_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t^{2\kappa-1}}P\Big(\Big\|\frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{t^\kappa}W'_t\Big\| \ge \eta\Big) \le -\inf_{\{Y:\|Y\|\ge\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\gamma}}\}}\frac{1}{2}\|Y\|^2 = -\frac{\eta^2}{2\gamma}\xrightarrow[\gamma\to 0]{} -\infty.$$

(2.9) is verified with an utilization of the pseudoinverse matrix properties. Let $T$ be an orthogonal matrix transforming $Q$ to the diagonal form: $\mathrm{diag}(Q) = T^*QT$. Due to

$$2J_\gamma(Y) = Y^*\big[\gamma\mathrm{I} + Q\big]^{-1}Y = Y^*T\big[\gamma\mathrm{I} + \mathrm{diag}(Q)\big]^{-1}T^*Y,$$

for $Y = Q^\oplus QY$ we have (recall that $Q^\oplus QQ^\oplus = Q^\oplus$, see [1])

$$\begin{aligned}
2J_\gamma(Y) &= Y^*Q^\oplus QT\big[\gamma\mathrm{I} + \mathrm{diag}(Q)\big]^{-1}T^*Y\\
&= Y^*Q^\oplus TT^*QT\big[\gamma\mathrm{I} + \mathrm{diag}(Q)\big]^{-1}T^*Y\\
&= Y^*Q^\oplus T\,\mathrm{diag}(Q)\big[\gamma\mathrm{I} + \mathrm{diag}(Q)\big)^{-1}T^*Y\\
&\xrightarrow[\gamma\to 0]{} Y^*Q^\oplus T\,\mathrm{diag}(Q)\,\mathrm{diag}^\oplus(Q)T^*Y\\
&= Y^*Q^\oplus T\,\mathrm{diag}(Q)T^*T\,\mathrm{diag}^\oplus(Q)T^*Y\\
&= Y^*Q^\oplus QQ^\oplus Y = Y^*Q^\oplus Y = \|Y\|^2_{Q^\oplus} = 2J(Y).
\end{aligned}$$

For $Y \ne Q^\oplus QY$, $\lim_{\gamma\to 0}J_\gamma(Y) = \infty$. □

## 3. MAIN RESULTS

### 3.1. **Nonlinear model, I.** $X_t$ solves (1.2) subject to $X_0 = x$.

($\mathbf{A_b}$) $b$ is locally Lipschitz continuous; for some $\alpha \ge 1$ and $C > 0$ there exists $\mathfrak{r} > 0$, depending on $\alpha, C$, such that

$$\langle\!\langle z, b(z)\rangle\!\rangle \le -\mathfrak{r}\|z\|^{1+\alpha},\ \|z\| > C.$$

($\mathbf{A_{\sigma,a}}$) $\sigma$ is Lipschitz continuous; for some $\Lambda > \lambda > 0$

$$\lambda\mathrm{I} \le a(z) \le \Lambda\mathrm{I}.$$

From Pardoux and Veretennikov [21], it follows that, under $(\mathbf{A_b})$ and $(\mathbf{A}_{\sigma,\mathbf{a}})$, the diffusion process $X$ is ergodic with the unique invariant measure $\mu(dz)$ possessing a density $p(z)$ relative to $dz$. Moreover, for $\alpha > 1$ and any $\beta < 0$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1+\|z\|)^{\alpha-1+\beta} p(z)dz < \infty.$$

$(\mathbf{A_H})$ $H$ is measurable function, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(z)p(z)dz \equiv 0$; for $\alpha \ge 1$, sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and any $\beta < 0 \wedge \frac{1}{2}(3-\alpha-\delta)$,

$$\|H(x)\| \le \mathfrak{c}(1+\|x\|)^{\alpha-1+\beta}.$$

**Remark 1.** Under $(\mathbf{A_b})$, $(\mathbf{A}_{\sigma,\mathbf{a}})$ and $(\mathbf{A_H})$), from Pardoux and Veretennikov, [21] Theorem 2, it follows that $U(x)$, given in (2.2), is bounded and solves the Poisson equation

$$\mathscr{L}U = -H$$

in the class of functions with Sobolev's partial second derivatives locally integrable in any power and a polynomial growth. With all this going on,

$$|\nabla U(x)| \le c(1+\|x\|)^{(\beta+\alpha-1)^+} \tag{3.1}$$

and, by embedding theorems [15], all entries of $\nabla U$ are continuous functions. So, the Krylov generalization of Itô's formula (see [13]) is applicable to $U(X_t)$:

$$U(X_t) = U(x) - \int_0^t H(X_s)ds + \int_0^t \nabla U(X_s)\sigma(X_s)dW_s. \tag{3.2}$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Under* $(\mathbf{A_b})$, $(\mathbf{A}_{\sigma,\mathbf{a}})$ *and* $(\mathbf{A_H})$, *the family* $(S^\kappa_t)_{t\ge 0}$ *obeys the MDP in* $(\mathbb{R}^q, \rho)$ *with the rate of speed* $\varrho(t)$ *and the rate function given in* (2.3) *with* $Q$ *defined in* (2.1).

3.2. **Nonlinear model, II.** Though Theorem 3.1 serves a wide class of bounded and unbounded functions $H$, it is far from to be universal especially for $\alpha = 1$.

So, we fix the next set of stronger assumptions.

$(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{b},\sigma})$ $b(x)$ and $\sigma(x)$ are Lipschitz continuous; for any $x', x'' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists a positive number $\nu$ such that

$$2\langle\!\langle (x'-x'', b(x')-b(x''))\rangle\!\rangle + \operatorname{trace}[\sigma(x')-\sigma(x'')][\sigma(x')-\sigma(x'')]^* \le -\nu\|x'-x''\|^2.$$

$(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{a}})$ $\lambda \mathrm{I} \le a(z) \le \Lambda \mathrm{I}$, for some $\Lambda > \lambda > 0$.

$(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{H}})$ $H(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous function.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Under* $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{b},\sigma})$, $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{a}})$ *and* $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{H}})$, *the statement of Theorem* 3.1 *remains valid.*

3.3. **Linear model.** The diffusion process $X_t$ solves (1.3), $A = A_{d\times d}$, $B = B_{d\times d}$ and $(W_t)_{t\ge 0}$ is a standard vector-valued Wiener process of the corresponding size.

For this setting, $(\mathbf{A_b})$ or $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{b},\sigma})$, and $(\mathbf{A_a})$ are too restrictive. We replace them by the following assumptions.

$(\mathbf{A})$ Eigenvalues of $A$ have negative real parts.

$(\mathbf{A_B})$ $D := BB^* + A^*BB^*A + \ldots + (A^*)^{d-1}BB^*A^{d-1}$ is nonsingular matrix.

$(\mathbf{A}''_{\mathbf{H}})$ Suppose either
1) $H$ possesses continuous and bounded partial derivatives,
2) $H$ is bounded, $BB^* > 0$.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Under* ($\mathbf{A}$), ($\mathbf{A_B}$) *and* ($\mathbf{A''_H}$), *the family* $(S^\kappa_t)_{t\to\infty}$ *obeys the MDP in* $(\mathbb{R}^d,\rho)$ *with rate of speed* $\varrho(t)$ *and the rate function given in* (2.3) *with* $Q$ *defined in* (2.1).

The next result deals with quadratic function $H$. Under ($\mathbf{A}$) and ($\mathbf{A_B}$), the invariant measure $\mu$ is zero mean Gaussian with nonsingular covariance matrix $P$ solving the Lyapunov equation

$$A^*P+PA+BB^*=0. \tag{3.3}$$

We introduce also a positive definite matrix $\Gamma=\Gamma_{q\times q}$ and a matrix $\Upsilon=\Upsilon_{q\times q}$ solving the Lyapunov equation

$$A^*\Upsilon+A\Upsilon+\Gamma=0.$$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Assume* ($\mathbf{A}$) *and* $BB^*>0$ *and*

$$H(x)=\langle\!\langle x,\Gamma x\rangle\!\rangle-\operatorname{trace}(\Gamma^{1/2}P\Gamma^{1/2}).$$

*Then, the family* $(S^\kappa_t)_{t\to\infty}$ *obeys the MDP in* $(\mathbb{R}^d,\rho)$ *with rate of speed* $\varrho(t)$ *and the rate function given in* (2.3) *with*

$$Q=4\operatorname{trace}(\Upsilon BPB^*\Upsilon)>0.$$

3.4. **More examples.** In this section, we give examples which are not explicitly compatible with Theorems 3.1 - 3.4.

**Example 3.1.** Let $d=1$, $H(x)=x^3$ and

$$dX_t=-X_t^3dt+dW_t. \tag{3.4}$$

Though ($\mathbf{A_b}$) holds with $\alpha=3$, Theorem 3.1 is not applicable since by ($\mathbf{A_H}$) only $H$ with property $\|H(x)\|\le c(1+\|x\|)^\gamma$, $\gamma<2$ is admissible.

Nevertheless, the MDP holds and is trivially verified. Indeed, (3.4) is nothing but (3.2) with $U(x)\equiv x$. Hence, $\nabla U(x)=1$ and $Q=1$.

Consequently, (ii) from Theorem 2.1 automatically holds.

(i) is reduced to $\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\big(X_t^2\ge t^{2\kappa}\varepsilon\big)=-\infty$ and is verified with the help of Theorem A.1 with $V(x)\equiv x^2$. Actually, by Itô's formula we find that $dV(X_t)=[-2V^2(X_t)+1]dt+dN_t$, where $N_t=\int_0^t 2X_sdW_s$. Hence,

$$\mathscr{L}V(x)\le -V^2(x)+1 \quad\text{and}\quad \langle N\rangle_t=\int_0^t 4V(X_s)ds.$$

**Example 3.2.** Let $d=1$ and

$$dX_t=b(x_t)dt+dW_t,$$

where $b(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous and symmetric, $b(x)=-b(-x)$, function (obviously $b(0)=0$). Under ($\mathbf{A'_{b,\sigma}}$), providing ($\mathbf{A_b}$), $X_t$ is an ergodic diffusion process with the symmetric invariant density, $p(z)=p(-z)$. So, any bounded $H(x)$, with $H(x)=-H(-x)$, possesses (1.1). We choose

$$H(x)=\operatorname{sign}(x),\ \text{letting}\ \operatorname{sign}(0)=0.$$

However, neither Theorem 3.3 nor Theorem 3.1 are compatible with the setting owing to $H(x)$ does not satisfy neither ($\mathbf{A'_H}$) nor ($\mathbf{A_H}$). Nevertheless, we show that the standard MDP holds. A computational trick proposes to use a decomposition $H=H'+H''$ for

$$H'(x)=\begin{cases} e^{-x}, & x>0\\ 0, & x=0\\ -e^{x}, & x<0\end{cases}$$

since $H'$ satisfies $(\mathbf{A_H})$ and

$$H''(x)=\begin{cases}1-e^{-x}, & x\ge 0\\ -1+e^{x}, & x<0\end{cases}$$

satisfies $(\mathbf{A'_H})$. Then, $U'(x)$ and $\nabla U'(x)$ are well defined and both are bounded; at the same time $U''(x)$ and $\nabla U''(x)$ are also well defined and $\nabla U''(x)$ is bounded, i.e. $|U''(x)|\le c(1+|x|)$.

Taking $U(x)=U'(x)+U''(x)$ we get bounded $\nabla U(x)=\nabla U'(x)+\nabla U''(x)$ and $U(x)$ satisfying the linear growth condition. Moreover, due to $M_t=M'_t+M''_t$, we have

$$M_t=\int_0^t\nabla U'(X_s)dW_s+\int_0^t\nabla U''(X_s)dW_s=\int_0^t\nabla U(X_s)dW_s,$$

providing $\langle M\rangle_t=\int_0^t\big(\nabla U(X_s)\big)^2ds$ with bounded $\big(\nabla U(x)\big)^2$.

Now, (i) and (ii) from Theorem 2.1 are verified in a standard way with the help of Theorems A.1, A.2.

**Example 3.3.** (Linear version of Langevin model.) A nonlinear Langevin's model, including our linear one, is studied in Wu, [33]. The result from [33] seems not to be accomplished. At least, we could not adapt assumptions from there to verify the MDP for the following setting.

Let $X_t=\begin{pmatrix}q_t\\ p_t\end{pmatrix}\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with $(q_t,p_t\in\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}dq_t&=p_tdt\\ dp_t&=-\Gamma p_tdt-\nabla\mathrm{F}(q_t)dt+\sigma dW_t,\end{aligned}\tag{3.5}$$

where $\nabla\mathrm{F}(q)=\Lambda q$ and matrices $\Lambda$, $\Gamma$ and $\sigma\sigma^*$ are positive definite. We verify the MDP with the help of Theorem 3.3.

It is expedient to write (3.5) to the form (1.3) with matrices (in a block form)

$$A=\begin{pmatrix}0 & \mathrm{I}\\ -\Lambda & -\Gamma\end{pmatrix}\quad\text{and}\quad B=\begin{pmatrix}0 & 0\\ 0 & \sigma\end{pmatrix}.$$

In accordance with Theorem 3.3, we have to verify only two conditions:

1) eigenvalues of $A$ have negative real parts,

2) the matrix D (see $(\mathbf{A_B})$) is nonsingular.

1) fulfils since free of noise (3.5):

$$\begin{aligned}\dot q_t&=p_t\\ \dot p_t&=-\Gamma p_t-\nabla\mathrm{F}(q_t)\end{aligned}$$

is asymptotically stable. Traditionally for the Langevin equation, this result is easily verified with the help of Lyapunov's function $V_t=\frac12\|p_t\|^2+F(q_t)$ and is omitted here.

2) holds since $D':=BB^*+A^*BB^*A(\le D)$ is nonsingular. Indeed,

$$D'=\begin{pmatrix}\Lambda\sigma^*\sigma\Lambda & \Lambda\sigma^*\sigma\Gamma\\ \Gamma\sigma^*\sigma\Lambda & \Gamma\sigma^*\sigma\Gamma+\sigma^*\sigma\end{pmatrix},$$

that is, with a vector $v=\begin{pmatrix}v_1\\ v_2\end{pmatrix}\ne 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\!\langle v,D^*Dv\rangle\!\rangle=\langle\!\langle v_1,\Lambda\sigma^*\sigma\Lambda v_1\rangle\!\rangle&+\langle\!\langle v_2,\Gamma\sigma^*\sigma\Gamma v_2\rangle\!\rangle+2\langle\!\langle v_1,\Lambda\sigma^*\sigma\Gamma v_2\rangle\!\rangle\\ &+\langle\!\langle v_2,\sigma^*\sigma v_2\rangle\!\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

By virtue of the well known inequality

$$2\langle\!\langle z_1,z_2\rangle\!\rangle\ge-\langle\!\langle z_1,z_1\rangle\!\rangle-\langle\!\langle z_2,z_2\rangle\!\rangle,\tag{3.6}$$

we get $\langle\!\langle v_1, \Lambda\sigma^*\sigma\Lambda v_1\rangle\!\rangle + \langle\!\langle v_2, \Gamma\sigma^*\sigma\Gamma v_2\rangle\!\rangle + 2\langle\!\langle v_1, \Lambda\sigma^*\sigma\Gamma v_2\rangle\!\rangle \geq 0$. Consequently, under $v_2 \neq 0$, we have $\langle\!\langle v, (D')^*D'v\rangle\!\rangle \geq \langle\!\langle v_2, \sigma^*\sigma v_2\rangle\!\rangle > 0$. Even though $v_2 = 0$, and so $v_1 \neq 0$, we also have $\langle\!\langle v, (D')^*D'v\rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle v_1, \Lambda\sigma^*\sigma v_1\Lambda\rangle\!\rangle > 0$.

Thus, under $(\mathbf{A}''_{\mathbf{H}})$, the MDP holds.

**Example 3.4.** (MDP for a smooth component of diffusion process.) Let $X^{(1)}_t$ be the first component of a diffusion process $X_t$ with entries $X^{(i)}_t$, $i = 1, \dots, d$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}^{(1)}_t &= X^{(2)}_t \\ \dot{X}^{(i)}_t &= X^{(i+1)}_t, \ i = 2, \dots, d-1 \\ dX^{(d)}_t &= -\sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i X^{(d-i)}_t dt + b dW_t, \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d$ and $b$ are positive numbers and $W_t$ is a Wiener process.

As in the previous example, we rewrite (3.7) to the form of (1.3) with

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$A_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{(d-1)\times(d-1)},$$

$A_{12} = 0$, $A_{22} = -a_d$, $A_{21} = \begin{pmatrix} -a_1 & -a_2 & \dots & -a_{d-1} \end{pmatrix}_{1\times(d-1)}$ and, analogously, $B_{11} = 0_{(d-1)\times(d-1)}$, $B_{12} = 0$, $B_{22} = b$, $B_{21} = 0_{1\times(d-1)}$.

We verify the MDP with the help of Theorem 3.3. In order to guarantee $(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{H}})$, suffice it to assume that roots of the polynomial

$$\phi(z) = z^d + a_1 z^{d-1} + \dots + a_{d-1}z + a_d$$

have negative real parts owing to the noise free version of (3.7) is nothing but the differential equation $x^{(d)}_t + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i x^{(d-i)}_t + a_d x_t = 0$.

Notice that $(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{B}})$ is fulfilled too since $D' = BB^* + A^*BB^*A (\leq D)$ is a nonsingular matrix. Actually, $D' = b^2 \begin{pmatrix} A^*_{21}A_{21} & A^*_{21}A_{22} \\ A_{21}A_{22} & A^2_{22}+1 \end{pmatrix}$ and so, we have

$$\langle\!\langle v, D^*Dv\rangle\!\rangle = b^2\Big[v_1^2\|A_{21}\|^2 + (A^2_{22}+1)\|v_2\|^2 + 2v_1A_{22}\langle\!\langle v_2, A_{21}\rangle\!\rangle\Big].$$

Taking $v = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0$, where $v_1$ is a number and $v_2$ is a vector of the size $d-1$, for $v_2 = 0$, and then $v_1 \neq 0$, we have $\langle\!\langle v, D^*Dv\rangle\!\rangle > 0$. Even though $v_2 \neq 0$, the use of (3.6) provides $\langle\!\langle v, D^*Dv\rangle\!\rangle \geq b^2A^2_{22}\|v_2\|^2 > 0$.

In order to establish the MDP for the family $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}\int_0^t H(X^{(1)}_s)ds\big)_{t\to\infty}$, we redefine the function $H$ as: $H(x^{(1)}) \equiv \mathsf{H}(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \dots, x^{(d)})$ and assume $\mathsf{H}$ satisfies $(\mathbf{A}''_{\mathbf{H}})$. Then, the family $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}\int_0^t \mathsf{H}(X_s)ds\big)_{t\to\infty}$ obeys the MDP with the rate of speed $\varrho(t)$ and the rate function $\mathsf{J}(Y) = \mathsf{J}(Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(d)})$ of the standard form (2.3).

Now, the desired MDP holds by Varadhan's contraction principle, [27], with the same rate of speed and the rate function

$$j(y) = \inf_{\{Y^{(2)},\dots,Y^{(d)}\}\in\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} J(y, Y^{(2)}, \dots, Y^{(d)}).$$

**Example 3.5.** Let $X_t$ ($\in \mathbb{R}$) be Gaussian diffusion with

$$dX_t = -X_t dt + dW_t$$

and $H(x) = x^2 \operatorname{sign}(x)$. This function satisfies (1.1) and, at the same time, is not compatible with Theorems 3.1 - 3.4. So, we suppose to embed this setting to a new one with a vector function $\mathsf{H}(x)$ with entries:

$$\mathsf{H}_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{sign}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{H}_2(x) = x^2 \operatorname{sign}(x) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{sign}(x),$$

which is MDP verifiable. Applying arguments from the proof of the Theorem 3.3, one can show the existence of $U_1(x)$ with bounded $\nabla U_1(x)$ such that

$$U_1(X_t) = U_1(x) - \int_0^t \mathsf{H}_1(X_s)ds + M_t^{(1)}$$

$$\langle M^{(1)}\rangle_t = \int_0^t (\nabla U_1(X_s))^2 ds.$$

Now, we establish similar property of $H_2(x)$. By the Krylov-Itô formula (see [13]), we find that

$$dH(X_t) = -\mathsf{H}_2(X_t)dt + |X_t|dW_t.$$

Consequently, $U_2(x) \equiv H(x)$ and $\langle M^{(2)}\rangle_t = \int_0^2 X_s^2 ds$.

Now, we may verify (i), (ii) from Theorem 2.1.

(i): Since $\nabla U_1$ is bounded, $U_1$ satisfies the linear growth condition. Thus,

$$|U_1| \le c(1 + |U_2|) = c(1 + |H(x)|) \le \mathfrak{c}(1 + x^2).$$

Hence, (i) is reduced to $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(X_t^2 \ge t^\kappa \varepsilon\big) = -\infty$. The latter holds owing to $X_t^2$ possesses an exponential moment: $Ee^{\lambda X_t^2} < \infty$ uniformly in $t$ over $\mathbb{R}_+$ and sufficiently small $\lambda$ and, therefore, the Chernoff inequality is effective. Write

$$\frac{1}{t^{2\kappa-1}} \log P\big(X_t^2 > t^\kappa \varepsilon\big) \le \frac{1}{t^{2\kappa-1}} \log\Big(e^{-\lambda t^\kappa \varepsilon + \log Ee^{\lambda X_t^2}}\Big)$$

$$\le -\lambda t^{1-\kappa}\varepsilon + \frac{\log Ee^{\lambda X_t^2}}{t^{2\kappa-1}} \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{} -\infty.$$

Notice that $|U_2(x)| = x^2$, so that, the (i) verification is the same as for $U_1$.

(ii): The martingale $M_t$ is vector-valued process with two entries $M_t^{(1)}$ and $M_t^{(2)}$. Hence, its variation process is a matrix

$$\langle M\rangle_t = \begin{pmatrix} \langle M^{(1)}\rangle_t & \langle M^{(1)}, M^{(2)}\rangle_t \\ \langle M^{(1)}, M^{(2)}\rangle_t & \langle M^{(2)}\rangle_t, \end{pmatrix}$$

so that, the entries of $Q$ are defined in the following way:

$$Q_{11} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(\nabla U_1(z)\big)^2 p(z)dz,$$

$$Q_{22} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} z^2 p(z)dz,$$

$$Q_{12} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla U_1(z)|z|p(z)dz.$$

Thus, (ii) is reduced to

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\Big|\int_0^t h(X_s)ds\Big| \ge t\varepsilon\Big) = -\infty, \tag{3.8}$$

where $h(x)$ is continuous function satisfying (1.1) and either

1) $|h(x)| \le c|x|$,

2) $h(x) = x^2 - \frac{1}{2}$.

In 1), we apply $h(x) = h'_l(x) + h''_l(x)$, borrowed from (4.1), and verify versions of (3.8) with $h'_l$ and $h''_l$ separately.

$h'_l$-version holds owing to by Theorem 3.1 ($\alpha = 1$) $\Big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}\int_0^t h'_l(X_s)ds\Big)_{t\to\infty}$ obeys $\varrho$-MDP with a nondegenerate rate function and $\kappa < 1$.

$h''_l$-version holds owing to $|h''_l(x)| \le I(|x| > l)|x| \le \frac{x^2}{l}$ and for sufficiently large $l$, $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\int_0^t X_s^2 ds > tl\varepsilon\Big) = -\infty$ verified with the help of Theorem A.1 for $V(x) = x^2$.

In 2), by Theorem 3.4, $\big(\frac{1}{t^\kappa}\int_0^t \big[X_s^2 - \frac{1}{2}\big]ds\big)_{t\to\infty}$ obeys $\varrho$-MDP with a nondegenerate rate function. So, it remains to recall that $\kappa < 1$.

Thus, $\varrho$-MDP for new family holds true with the rate function $J(Y)$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, defined in (2.3). Hence, the original family possesses the MDP with the quadratic rate function

$$j(y) = \inf_{\{Y_1, Y_2 : Y_1 + Y_2 = y\}} J(Y).$$

## 4. PROOF OF THEOREMS FROM SECTION 3

4.1. **The proof of Theorem 3.1.** Denote by $M_t = \int_0^t \nabla U(X_s)\sigma(X_s)dW_s$ the martingale from (3.2) having $\langle M\rangle_t = \int_0^t \nabla U(X_s)a(X_s)\nabla^* U(X_s)ds$.

We shall verify (i) and (ii) from Theorem 2.1.

(i) holds since, by Remark 1, $U$ is bounded.

(ii) is verified in a few steps.

Step 1: $Q$ identification. We show that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla U(z)a(z)\nabla^* U(z)p(z)dz = Q$. This fact is well known and is given here for a reader convenience only. Notice that, by (2.2),

$$Q = E\big[H(X_0^\mu)U^*(X_0^\mu) + U(X_0^\mu)H^*(X_0^\mu)\big],$$

where $X_t^\mu$ the stationary version of $X_t$, that is, the version solving (1.2) subject to $X_0^\mu$ the random vector, independent of $W_t$, with the distribution provided by the invariant measure $\mu$. Hence, suffice it to show that

$$E\big[\nabla U(X_0^\mu)a(X_0^\mu)\nabla^* U(X^)\mu_0\big] = E\big[H(X_0^\mu)U^*(X_0^\mu) + U(X_0^\mu)H^*(X_0^\mu)\big]. \tag{4.1}$$

We verify (4.1) with the help of Itô's formula

$$\begin{aligned} U(X_t^\mu)U^*(X_t^\mu) = U(X_0^\mu)U^*(X_0^\mu) - \int_0^t \big[H(X_s^\mu)U^*(X_s^\mu) + U(X_s^\mu)H^*(X_0^\mu)\big]ds \\ + \int_0^t \big[U(X_s^\mu)dM_s^* + dM_s U^*(X_0^\mu)\big] + \int_0^t \nabla(X_s^\mu)a(X_s^\nu)\nabla^*(X_s^\mu)ds \end{aligned}$$

by taking the expectation.

Step 2. Preliminaries. Set $\mathsf{H}(x) = \nabla U(x)a(x)\nabla^*(x) - Q$ and let $h(x)$ denotes any entry of $\mathsf{H}(x)$. For (ii) to be valid suffice it to show that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\Big|\int_0^t h(X_s)ds\Big| > t\varepsilon\Big) = -\infty. \tag{4.2}$$

Recall $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(z)p(z)dz = 0$. By (3.1),

$$|h(x)| \le c(1 + \|x\|)^{2(\beta+\alpha-1)^+}.$$

We consider separately two cases provided by a special choice of

$$\beta < 0 \wedge \frac{1}{2}(3 - \alpha - \delta) \text{ for sufficiently small } \delta > 0.$$

(see, $(\mathbf{A_H})$):
- $(\alpha = 1) : |h(x)|$ is bounded;
- $(\alpha > 1) : |h(x)| \le c(1 + \|x\|)^{1+\alpha-\delta}$, $1 + \alpha - \delta \ge 2$.

Step 3. $\boxed{\alpha = 1}$ For sufficiently large number $l$, set

$$h'_l(x) = \begin{cases} h(x) & \|x\| \le l, \\ v_l(x) & l < \|x\| \le l+1 \\ 0 & \|x\| > l+1, \end{cases}$$

where $v_l(x)$ is bounded continuous function such that $h'_l(x)$ is continuous function with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h'_l(z)p(z)dz = 0$. In contrast to $h$, the function $h'_l$ decreases fast to zero with $\|x\| \to \infty$, so that, a negative constant $\beta'$ can be chosen such that

$$|h'_l(x)| \le c(1 + |x|)^{\beta'+\alpha-1} \equiv c(1 + |x|)^{\beta'}.$$

In accordance with this property, $u(x) = -\int_0^\infty E_x h'(X_t)dt$ solves the Poisson equation $\mathscr{L}u = -h'_l$ and is bounded jointly with $\nabla u(x)$ (see, Remark 1). Hence, $u(X_t) = u(x) - \int_0^t h'(X_s)ds + m_t$ with the martingale $m_t = \int_0^t \nabla u(X_s)\sigma(X_s)dW_s$ having $\langle m\rangle_t = \int_0^t \nabla u(X_s)a(X_s)\nabla^* u(X_s)ds$. The negligibility of $\frac{u(x)-u(X_t)}{t}$ in $\varrho$-MDP scale is provided by the boundedness of $u(x)$. The same type negligibility of $\frac{1}{t}m_t$ is provided by the boundedness of $\nabla u^*(x)a(x)\nabla u(x)$, due to Theorem A.2.

Consequently, a version of (4.2) with $h'_l$ holds true.

Set $h''_l = h - h'_l$. Since $h$ is bounded, $|h''_l(x)| \le cI(\|x\| > l) \le \frac{c}{l^2}\|x\|^2$. Consequently a version of (4.2) with $h''_l$ is reduced to

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\int_0^t \|X_s\|^2 ds > t(l^2\varepsilon)\Big) = -\infty$$

and is verified with the help of Theorem A.2 for $V(x) = \|x\|^2$ owing to

$$\mathscr{L}V(x) \le -cV(x) + \mathfrak{c}, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle N_t\rangle \le \int_0^t \mathbf{c}\big(1 + V(X_s)\big)ds$$

are fulfilled under $(\mathbf{A_b})$ and $(\mathbf{A}_{\sigma,\mathbf{a}})$ (a verification of these facts is accomplished with the help of Itô's formula).

Step 4. $\boxed{\alpha > 1}$ We apply again the decomposition $h = h'_l + h''_l$. With chosen $l$, $|h'_l|$ is decreasing fast to zero, with $\|x\| \to \infty$, and is bounded by $c(1+l)^{1+\alpha-\delta}$. So, the version of (4.2) with $h'_l$ is verified as in the case "$\alpha = 1$".

Notice that

$$|h''_l(x)| \le c(1 + \|x\|)^{1+\alpha-\delta)} I(\|x\| > l) \le \frac{c}{l^\delta}(1 + \|x\|)^{1+\alpha} \le \frac{\mathfrak{c}}{l^\delta}\big(1 + V(x)\big),$$

where $V(x) = \frac{\|x\|^{4+2\alpha}}{1+\|x\|^{3+\alpha}}$. Hence, the version of (4.2) with $h''_l$ is reduced to

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\int_0^t V(X_s)ds > tl^\delta\Big) = -\infty.$$

To this end, we apply Theorem A.1.

First, taking into account that $\|x\|^{3+\alpha} = \big(\|x\|^2\big)^{\frac{3+\alpha}{2}}$, $\|x\|^{4+2\alpha} = \big(\|x\|^2\big)^{2+\alpha}$ and $\frac{3+\alpha}{2} > 2$, by the Itô formula we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
d\|X_t\|^2 &= \big[2\langle\!\langle X_t, b(X_t\rangle\!\rangle + \operatorname{trace}\big(a(X_t)\big)\big]dt + 2\langle\!\langle X_t, \sigma(X_t)dW_t\rangle\!\rangle, \\
d\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha} &= \Big(\frac{3+\alpha}{2} - 1\Big)\big(\|X_t\|^2\big)^{\frac{3+\alpha}{2}-1}\big\{2\langle\!\langle X_t, b(X_t)\rangle\!\rangle + \operatorname{trace}\big(a(X_t)\big)\big\} \\
&\quad + 2\Big[\frac{3+\alpha}{2} - 1\Big]\Big[\frac{3+\alpha}{2} - 2\Big]\big(\|X_t\|^2\big)^{\frac{3+\alpha}{2}-2}\langle\!\langle X_t, a(X_t)X_t\rangle\!\rangle\Big]dt \\
&\quad + \Big(\frac{3+\alpha}{2} - 1\Big)\big(\|X_t\|^2\big)^{\frac{3+\alpha}{2}-1} 2\langle\!\langle X_t, \sigma(X_t)dW_t\rangle\!\rangle, \\
d\|X_t\|^{4+2\alpha} &= \big(1+\alpha\big)\big(\|X_t\|^2\big)^{1+\alpha}\big\{2\langle\!\langle X_t, b(X_t)\rangle\!\rangle + \operatorname{trace}\big(a(X_t)\big)\big\} \\
&\quad + 2\big[1+\alpha\big]\alpha\big(\|X_t\|^2\big)^{\alpha}\langle\!\langle X_t, a(X_t)X_t\rangle\!\rangle\Big]dt \\
&\quad + \big(1+\alpha\big)\big(\|X_t\|^2\big)^{1+\alpha} 2\langle\!\langle X_t, \sigma(X_t)dW_t\rangle\!\rangle, \\
d\frac{1}{1+\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha}} &= -\frac{d\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha}}{(1+\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha})^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{2(1+\alpha)\|X_t\|^{1+\alpha}}{(1+\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha})^3}\langle\!\langle X_t, a(X_t)X_t\rangle\!\rangle dt, \\
dV(X_t) &= \frac{d\|X_t\|^{4+2\alpha}}{1+\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha}} + \|X_t\|^{4+2\alpha} d\frac{1}{1+\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha}} \\
&\quad + \frac{2\big(1+\alpha\big)^2\|X_t\|^{3(1+\alpha)}\langle\!\langle X_t, a(X_t)X_t\rangle\!\rangle}{(1+\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha})^2}dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $dV(X_t) = \mathscr{L}V(X_t)dt + dN_t$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}V(x) &= \frac{1}{1+\|x\|^{3+\alpha}}\Big[(1+\alpha)\|x\|^{2(1+\alpha)}\big\{2\langle\!\langle x, b(x)x\rangle\!\rangle + \operatorname{trace}(a(x))\big\} \\
&\quad + 2\alpha\big(1+\alpha\big)\|x\|^{2\alpha}\langle\!\langle x, a(x)x\rangle\!\rangle\Big] \\
&\quad - \frac{\|x\|^{4+2\alpha}}{(1+\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha})^2}\Big[\frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha)\|x\|^{1+\alpha}\{2\langle\!\langle x, b(x)x\rangle\!\rangle + \operatorname{trace}(a(x))\} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha)(\alpha-1)\|x\|^{\alpha-1}\langle\!\langle x, a(x)x\rangle\!\rangle\Big] \\
&\quad + \frac{\|x\|^{4+2\alpha}}{(1+\|X_t\|^{3+\alpha})^3} 2(1+\alpha)\|x\|^{1+\alpha}\langle\!\langle x, a(x)x\rangle\!\rangle \\
&\le (1+\alpha)\langle\!\langle x, b(x)x\rangle\!\rangle\Big[\frac{2\|x\|^{2(1+\alpha)}}{1+\|x\|^{3+\alpha}} - \frac{\|x\|^{4+2\alpha}}{(1+\|x\|^{3+\alpha})^2}\Big] + o(\|x\|^{2\alpha}) \\
&= (1+\alpha)\langle\!\langle x, b(x)x\rangle\!\rangle\frac{2\|x\|^{2(1+\alpha)} + 2\|x\|^{5+3\alpha} - \|x\|^{4+2\alpha}}{(1+\|x\|^{3+\alpha})^2} + o(\|x\|^{2\alpha}) \\
&\le -c\|x\|^{2\alpha} + \mathfrak{c} \le -\mathbf{c}V^{\frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha}}(x) + \mathfrak{c}
\end{aligned}$$

and $N_t = \int_0^t \langle\!\langle X_s, \sigma(X_s)dW_s\rangle\!\rangle\Big[\frac{2(1+\alpha)\|X_s\|^{2(1+\alpha)}}{1+\|X_s\|^{3+\alpha}} - \frac{(1+\alpha)\|X_s\|^{5+3\alpha}}{(1+\|X_s\|^{3+\alpha})^2}\Big]$, that is,

$$\langle N\rangle_t \le \int_0^t \big(c\|X_s\|^{2\alpha} + \mathfrak{c}\big)ds \le \int_0^t \big(\mathbf{c}V^{\frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha}}(X_s) + \mathfrak{c}\big)ds.$$

Thus, the assumptions of Theorem A.1 are fulfilled and, thereby, for sufficiently large $l$, we have $\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\big(\int_0^t V^{\frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha}}(X_s)ds > tl^{\delta}\big) = -\infty$ and, it is left to notice that $\frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha} > 1$ for $\alpha > 1$. $\square$

4.2. **The proof of Theorem 3.2.** By $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{b},\sigma})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\!\langle x, b(x)\rangle\!\rangle &= \langle\!\langle x,(b(x)-b(0))\rangle\!\rangle + \langle\!\langle x, b(0)\rangle\!\rangle \\ &\le -\langle\!\langle x, B_0x\rangle\!\rangle + \|b(0)\|\|x\| \\ &\le -\nu\|x\|^2 + \|b(0)\|\|x\|\end{aligned}$$

that is, there exists $r>0$ such that $\langle\!\langle x, b(x)\rangle\!\rangle \le -r\|x\|^2$.

Hence, $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{b},\sigma}) \Rightarrow (\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{b}})(\alpha=1)$. However since, by $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{H}})$, $\|H(z)\| \le c(1+\|z\|)$ is admissible, Theorem 2 from Pardoux and Veretennikov, [21], is no longer applicable. At the same time, Theorem 1 from [21] states that $U$ from (2.2) solves the Poisson equation $\mathscr{L}U(z) = -H(z)$ and satisfies the following properties: for some $m>2$,

$$\|U(x)\| \le c(1+\|x\|^m) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla U(x)\| \le c(1+\|x\|^m).$$

Nevertheless, regardless of that, $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{H}})$ provides

$$\|U(x)\| \le c(1+\|x\|) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla U(x)\| \le c. \tag{4.3}$$

Actually, let $X^x_t$ denotes the solution of (1.2) subject to $X_0 = x$. Since for any $x'$ and $x''$, we have $U(x') - U(x'') = \int_0^\infty E\big[H(X^{x'}_t) - H(X^{x''}_t)\big]dt$, by $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{H}})$, we have ($L$ is the Lipschitz constant for $H$)

$$\begin{aligned}|U(x') - U(x'')| &\le L\int_0^\infty \big|E\big[X^{x'}_t - X^{x''}_t\big]\big|dt \\ &\le L\int_0^\infty \Big(E\|X^{x'}_t - X^{x''}_t\|^2\Big)^{1/2}dt,\end{aligned}$$

where $d[X^{x'}_t - X^{x''}_t] = [b(X^{x'}_t) - b(X^{x''}_t)]dt + [\sigma(X^{x'}_t) - \sigma(X^{x''}_t)]dW_t$. With the help of Itô's formula, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}d\|X^{x'}_t - X^{x''}_t\|^2_t &= 2\langle\!\langle (X'_t - X^{x''}_t), [b(X^{x'}_t) - b(X^{x''}_t)]\rangle\!\rangle dt \\ &\quad + 2\langle\!\langle (X'_t - X^{x''}_t), [\sigma(X^{x'}_t) - \sigma(X^{x''}_t)]dW_t\rangle\!\rangle \\ &\quad + \operatorname{trace}[\sigma(X^{x'}_t) - \sigma(X^{x''}_t)][\sigma(X^{x'}_t) - \sigma(X^{x''}_t)]^*.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $v_t = E\|X^{x'}_t - X^{x''}_t\|^2$ is differentiable relative to $dt$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\dot v_t = 2E\Big[&\langle\!\langle [X^{x'}_t - X^{x''}_t], [b(X^{x'}_t - b(X^{x''}_t)]\rangle\!\rangle \\ &+ \operatorname{trace}[\sigma(X^{x'}_t) - \sigma(X^{x''}_t)][\sigma(X^{x'}_t) - \sigma(X^{x''}_t)]^*\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Then, by $(\mathbf{A}'_{\mathbf{b},\sigma})$, we have $\dot v_t \le -\nu v_t$, i.e., $v_t \le \|x' - x''\|^2 e^{-t\nu}$. The latter implies the Lipschitz continuity of $U$ and, in turn, (4.3).

We proceed the proof with the verification of (i) and (ii) from Theorem 2.1.

(i): Due to (4.3), suffice it show that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t)\log P\big(\|X_t\|^2 > \varepsilon t^{2\kappa}\big) = -\infty$ what is verified with the help of Theorem A.1 for $V(x) = \|x\|^2$. With the help of Itô's formula, one can find that

$$\mathscr{L}V(x) = 2\langle\!\langle x, b(x)\rangle\!\rangle + \operatorname{trace} a(x) \quad \text{and} \quad N_t = \int_0^t 2\langle\!\langle X_s, \sigma(X_s)dW_s\rangle\!\rangle$$

and next that $\mathscr{L}V(x) \le -cV(x) + \mathfrak{c}$, $\quad \langle N\rangle_t \le \int_0^t \mathbf{c}V(X_s)ds$.

(ii): It is verified similarly to (4.2) for $\alpha = 1$.

□

4.3. **The proof of Theorem 3.3.** Under $(\mathbf{A})$, $(\mathbf{A_B})$, the Pardoux-Veretennikov concept is no longer valid. Nevertheless, $(\mathbf{A})$ and $(\mathbf{A_B})$ provide the ergodicity of $X = (X_t)_{t\ge 0}$ with the unique zero mean Gaussian invariant measure characterized by a nonsingular covariance matrix $P$ solving Lyapunov's equation, see (3.3).

We prove the theorem in a few steps.

Step 1. Invariant and transition densities. For $X_0 = x$, the diffusion process $X_t$ is Gaussian with the expectation $EX_t = e^{At}x$ and the covariance matrix

$$\mathrm{cov}(X_t, X_t) = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A^*}BB^*e^{(t-s)A}ds =: P_t$$

solving the differential equation

$$\dot{P}_t = A^*P_t + P_tA + BB^* \tag{4.4}$$

subject to $P_0 = 0$. It is well known, and is readily verified that, under $(\mathbf{A})$ and $(\mathbf{A_B})$, we have $P_t > 0$ over $t > 0$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} P_t = P(> 0)$. If in addition $BB^* > 0$, then, for $t$ in a vicinity of zero,

$$|P_t^{-1/2}| \le \frac{c}{\sqrt{t}}. \tag{4.5}$$

Since $P, P_t > 0$, the invariant density $p(y)$ and the density of $P_x^{(t)}(dy)$ relative to $dy$ are defined as:

$$p(y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi \det P)^{d/2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|y\|^2_{P^{-1}}}$$

$$p(x,t,y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi \det P_t)^{d/2}} \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\big\|y - e^{tA}x\big\|^2_{P_t^{-1}}\Big)$$

Step 2. $U$ existence. We prove that $U(x)$ from (2.2) is well defined over $\mathbb{R}^d$ by showing

$$\int_0^\infty |E_xH(X_t)|dt < \infty. \tag{4.6}$$

Assume $(\mathbf{A''_H})_{1)}$. Let $X_t^\mu$, $X_t^x$ denote the stationary version of $X_t$ and $X_t$ with $X_0 = x$ respectively. By (1.1) and the Lipschitz property of $H$ (with the Lipschitz constant $L$), it holds $|E_x(X_t)| = |E[H(X_t^x) - H(X_t^\mu)| \le LE|X_t^x - X_t^\mu|$, where, by (1.2), $\frac{d}{dt}[X_t^x - X_t^\mu] = A[X_t^x - X_t^\mu]$, i.e., $[X_t^x - X_t^\mu] = e^{tA}[x - X_0^\mu]$. Hence and by $(\mathbf{A})$, there exists a positive constant $\lambda$ such that $|X_t^x - X_t^\mu| \le e^{-t\lambda}c(1 + \|x\| + \|X_0^\mu\|)$. The random vector $X_0^\mu$ is Gaussian, so that, $E\|X_0^\mu\| = c$.

Thus, $|E_x(X_t)| \le e^{-t\lambda}\mathfrak{c}(1 + \|x\|)$ and (4.6) holds true.

Assume $(\mathbf{A''_H})_{2)}$. We may adapt the results of Meyn and Tweedie, [19] (see also Mattingly and Stuart, [17] and Mattingly Stuart and Higham, [18]) for getting (4.6). However, taking into account the explicit formulae for $p(y)$ and $p(x,t,y)$, the direct proof of (4.6) is given.

For a definiteness, let $|H| \le K$. We apply an obvious inequality

$$|E_xH(X_t)| \le K\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big|p(x,t,y) - p(y)\big|dy \ (\le 2K).$$

A changing of variables: $z = (y - e^{tA}z)P_t^{-1/2}$ and the identity

$$\frac{p(P_t^{1/2}z + e^{tA}x)}{p(x,t,P_t^{1/2}z + e^{tA}x)} = \sqrt{\frac{\det P_t}{\det P}}$$
$$\times \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\Big[\langle\!\langle z, (P_tP^{-1} - \mathrm{I})z\rangle\!\rangle + 2\langle\!\langle P^{-1/2}z, e^{tA}x\rangle\!\rangle + \|e^{tA}x\|^2_{P_t^{-1}}\Big]\Big)$$

provide

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|p(x,t,y)-p(y)\big|dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big|1-\frac{p(y)}{p(x,t,y)}\Big|p(x,t,y)dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|1-\frac{p(P_t^{1/2}z+e^{tA}x)}{p(x,t,P_t^{1/2}z+e^{tA}x)}\right|p(z)dz \\
&\le \left|\sqrt{\frac{\det P_t}{\det P}}-1\right| + \sqrt{\frac{\det P_t}{\det P}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big|\exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\Big[\langle\!\langle z,(P_tP^{-1}-\mathrm{I})z\rangle\!\rangle \\
&\quad + 2\langle\!\langle P^{-1/2}z, e^{tA}x\rangle\!\rangle + \|e^{tA}x\|^2_{P_t^{-1}}\Big]\Big)-1\Big|p(z)dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to $(\mathbf{A})$, $e^{tA}x$ converges to zero in $t\to\infty$ exponentially fast in a sense that $|e^{tA}x|\le ce^{-t\lambda}\|x\|$ for some generic $\lambda>0$. Moreover, $|P_tP^{-1}-\mathrm{I}|\le \mathfrak{c}e^{-t\lambda}$, owing to $P-P_t$ solves the differential equation $\dot{\triangle}_t = A^*\triangle_t+\triangle_tA$ subject to $\triangle_0=P$ (see, (3.3) and (4.4)) . The above-mentioned convergence implies also

$$\Big|\Big(\frac{\det P_t}{\det P}\Big)^{1/2}-1\Big|\le \mathbf{c}e^{-t\lambda}.$$

Thus, there exists an appropriate positive continuous function $\upsilon(x)$ $(<\infty)$ over $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that for $t\ge t_0>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big|p(x,t,y)-p(y)\big|dy &\le ce^{-t\lambda}\Big[1+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\{\|z\|^2+\|x\|^2\}e^{\mathfrak{c}e^{-t\lambda}[\|z\|^2+\|x\|^2]}p(z)dz\Big] \\
&\le ce^{-t\lambda}(1+\upsilon(\|x\|))
\end{aligned}$$

and, in turn, (4.6) holds true, owing to

$$\int_0^\infty|E_xH(X_s)|ds\le 2Kt_0+\int_{t_0}^\infty|E_xH(X_s)|ds\le 2K+\frac{Kc}{\lambda}c(1+\upsilon(\|x\|)).$$

Step 3. $\nabla U$ existence. Assume $(\mathbf{A''_H})_{1)}$ and notice that

$$\int_0^\infty\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_xH(P_tz+e^{tA}x)\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|z\|^2}dz\Big|dt\le \text{const.} \tag{4.7}$$

Since $U(x)=-\int_0^\infty\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}H(P_tz+e^{tA}x)\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|z\|^2}dzdt$, by virtue of of (4.7) we have

$$\nabla U(x)=-\int_0^\infty\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_xH(P_tz+e^{tA}x)\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|z\|^2}dzdt.$$

In particular, $\nabla U$ is bounded.

Assume $(\mathbf{A''_H})_{2)}$. Now, we prove that

$$\int_0^\infty\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}H(y)\nabla_xp(x,t,y)dy\Big|dt\le\text{const.} \tag{4.8}$$

The use of $\nabla_xp(x,t,y)=-p(x,t,y)\big(y-e^{tA}x\big)^*P_t^{-1}e^{tA},\ t>0$, provides

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}H(y)\nabla_xp(x,t,y)dy &= -EH(X_t^x)(X_t^x-EX_t^x)^*P_t^{-1}e^{tA}. \\
&= E[H(X_t^x)-EH(X_t^x)][X_t^x-EX_t^x]^*P_t^{-1}e^{tA}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, taking into account the boundedness of $H$ and (4.5), by Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality we get (with a generic positive constant $\lambda$):

$$\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(y)\nabla_x p(x,t,y)dy\Big| \le c\Big(E\|X^x_t - EX^x_t\|^2\Big)^{1/2}|P^{-1}_t||e^tA|$$
$$\le \mathfrak{c}e^{-t\lambda}\big(\,\mathrm{trace}(P_t)\big)^{1/2}|P^{-1}_t| \le \mathbf{c}\frac{e^{-t\lambda}}{\sqrt{t}}$$

Then, (4.8) holds and $\nabla U$ is bounded.

Step 4. $M_t$ existence. Since an applicability of Itô's (Krylov-Itô's) formula to $U(X_t)$ is questionable, we show that $(M_t, \mathscr{F}^X_t)_{t\ge 0}$, with

$$M_t = U(X_t) - U(x) + \int_0^t H(X_s)ds,$$

is the continuous martingale,

$$\langle M\rangle_t = \int_0^t \nabla^* U(X_s)BB^*\nabla U(X_s)ds \tag{4.9}$$

and $E\|M_t\|^2 < \infty$ over $t\in\mathbb{R}_+$; the latter is provided by the boundedness of $\nabla U$ .

The use of a homogeneity in $t$ of the Markov process $X_t$ enables to claim that $U(X_t)$ admits the following presentation a.s.,

$$U(X_t) = \int_t^\infty E_{X_t}U(X_s)ds = \int_t^\infty E\big(H(X_s)|\mathscr{F}^X_t\big)ds.$$

Then for any $t' < t$, we have

$$M_t - M_{t'} = \int_{t'}^\infty E\big(H(X_s)|\mathscr{F}^X_t\big)ds - \int_{t'}^\infty E\big(H(X_s)|\mathscr{F}^X_{t'}\big)ds$$
$$+ \int_{t'}^t E\big(H(X_s)|\mathscr{F}^X_t\big)ds - \int_{t'}^t H(X_s)ds \quad \text{a.s.}$$

and the martingale property, $E(M_t|\mathscr{F}^X_{t'}) = M_{t'}$ a.s., becomes obvious.

Now, we establish (4.9) with the help of well known fact: for any $t > 0$, $\langle M\rangle_t$ coincides with the limit, in probability, in $k\to\infty$ of

$$\sum_{1\le j\le k}\big(M_{t^k_j} - M_{t^k_{j-1}}\big)\big(M_{t^k_j} - M_{t^k_{j-1}}\big)^*,$$

where $0 \equiv t^k_0 < t^k_1 < \ldots < t^k_{t_k} \equiv t$ is a condensing sequence of time values. We recall only that $M_{t^k_j} - M_{t^k_{j-1}} = U(X_{t^k_j}) - U(X_{t^k_{j-1}}) + O(t^k_j - t^k_{j-1})$ and

$$U(X_{t^k_j}) - U(X_{t^k_{j-1}}) = \nabla^* U(X_{t^k_{j-1}})B\big[W_{t^k_j} - W_{t^k_{j-1}}\big] + O(t^k_j - t^k_{j-1}).$$

Step 5. (i) verification. Due to the linear growth condition of $\|U(x)\|$, suffice it to show that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\big(V(X_t) > t^2\varepsilon\big) = -\infty. \tag{4.10}$$

for $V(x) = \langle\!\langle x, \Gamma x\rangle\!\rangle$ with an appropriate positive definite matrix $\Gamma$. In view of (**A**), it is convenient to choose $\Gamma$ solving the Lyapunov equation $A^*\Gamma + \Gamma A + \mathrm{I} = 0$. The function $V(x)$ belongs to the range of definition for $\mathscr{L}$ with

$$\mathscr{L}V(x) = \langle\!\langle x, (A^*\Gamma + \Gamma A)x\rangle\!\rangle + \mathrm{trace}(B\Gamma B^*)$$
$$= -\|x\|^2 + \mathrm{trace}(B\Gamma B^*) \le -cV(x) + \mathfrak{c}$$

while $V(X_t) - V(x) - \int_0^t \mathscr{L}V(X_s)ds = \int_0^t 2\langle\!\langle X_s, \Gamma B dW_s\rangle\!\rangle =: N_t$ is the martingale (relative to $(\mathscr{F}^X_t)$) with $\langle N\rangle_t = \int_0^t 4\langle\!\langle X_s, \Gamma^2 X_s\rangle\!\rangle dt \le \int_0^t cV(X_s)ds$.

Now, (4.10) is provided by Corollary 1 to Theorem A.1.

Step 6. (ii) verification. Since $\nabla U$ is bounded and continuous, (ii) holds true if

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\Big(\Big|\int_0^t h(X_s)ds\Big|>t\varepsilon\Big)=-\infty$$

for any bounded and continuous $h:\mathbb{R}^d\Rightarrow\mathbb{R}$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}h(z)p(z)=0$.

Assume for a moment that $h$ satisfy $(\mathbf{A}''_{\mathbf{H}})_{1)}$ from Theorem 3.3. Then, the function $u(x)=-\int_0^\infty Eh(X_t)dt$ is well defined and $(u(X_t),\mathscr{F}_t^X)_{t\geq 0}$ is the semimartingale: $u(X_t)=u(x)-\int_0^t h(X_s)ds+m_t$, where $(m_t,\mathscr{F}_t^X)_{t\geq 0}$ is the continuous martingale with $\langle m\rangle_t=\int_0^t\nabla^*u(X_s)BB^*\nabla U(X_s)ds$ and $\nabla u(x)$ is bounded and continuous.

Hence, suffice it to verify (4.11) with $\int_0^t h(X_s)ds$ replaced by $u(X_t)$ and $m_t$ separately.

First of all notice that the version of (4.11) with $m_t$ is valid due to Theorem A.2 owing to $\langle m\rangle_t\leq Kt$, where $K\geq\nabla^*u(X_t)BB^*\nabla u(X_t)$ in $t$ over $\mathbb{R}_+$. Further, because of $\nabla u$ is bounded and, then, $u$ satisfies the linear growth condition, the version of (4.11) with $u(X_t)$ is reduced to (4.10).

If $h$ does not satisfy $(\mathbf{A}''_{\mathbf{H}})_{1)}$, we apply the decomposition $h=h'+h''$ borrowed from the proof of Theorem 3.1, $\alpha=1$. Then, the version of (4.11) with $h''$ is reduced to: for sufficiently large $l$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\Big(\int_0^t\langle\!\langle X_s,\Gamma X_s\rangle\!\rangle ds>t(l^2\varepsilon)\Big)=-\infty,$$

and is verified with the help of Theorem A.1 for $V(x)=\langle\!\langle x,\Gamma x\rangle\!\rangle$.

The verification of (4.11) with $h'$ differs from the corresponding part of proof for Theorem 3.1, $\alpha=1$. Let $l$, involved in the definition of $h'$, and $\varepsilon>0$ be chosen. Since $h'$ is compactly supported, there exists a polynomial $h_\varepsilon$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}c_\varepsilon&:=\sup_x|h'(x)-h_\varepsilon(x)|=o(\varepsilon)\\ d_\varepsilon&:=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}h_\varepsilon(z)p(z)dz=o(\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Because of $\widehat{h}_\varepsilon=h_\varepsilon-d_\varepsilon$ satisfies (1.1) and $(\mathbf{A}''_{\mathbf{H}})_{1)}$, the validity of (4.11) with $\widehat{h}_\varepsilon$ is obvious. So, it is left to recall only that $\sup_x|h'(x)-\widehat{h}_\varepsilon(x)|=o(\varepsilon)$. □

4.4. **The proof of Theorem 3.4.** Obviously, $H(x)$ satisfies (1.1).

We shall verify (i), (ii) from Theorem 2.1. By virtue of (2.2), the quadratic form of $H$ is inherited by $U$. We examine the following $U(x)=\langle\!\langle x,\Upsilon x\rangle\!\rangle-\upsilon$ with a positive definite matrix $\Upsilon$ and positive number $\upsilon$. By Itô's formula we find that

$$dU(X_t)=\underbrace{\big[\langle\!\langle X_t,[\Upsilon A+A^*\Upsilon]X_t\rangle\!\rangle+\mathrm{trace}(B^*\Upsilon B)\big]}_{\text{candidate to be }-H(X_t)}dt+\underbrace{2\langle\!\langle X_t,\Upsilon BdW_t\rangle\!\rangle}_{=M_t}.$$

The realization of this project requires for $\Upsilon$ to be a solution of Lyapunov's equation $\Upsilon A+A^*\Upsilon+\Gamma=0$ what, in particular, provides $\mathrm{trace}(B^*\Upsilon B)=\mathrm{trace}(\Gamma^{1/2}P\Gamma^{1/2})$, where $P$ is the covariance of the invariant measure. With chosen $\Upsilon$, set $\mathsf{D}=\Upsilon BPB^*\Upsilon$ and notice that $\langle M\rangle_t=\int_0^t 4\langle\!\langle X_s,\mathsf{D}X_s\rangle\!\rangle ds$

(i) is reduced to

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\Big(\langle\!\langle X_t,\Gamma X_t\rangle\!\rangle>t^\kappa\varepsilon\Big)=-\infty$$

which holds since for positive and sufficiently small $\lambda$ the moment generating function $\log Ee^{\lambda\langle\!\langle X_t,\Upsilon X_t\rangle\!\rangle}$ is bounded over $t\in\mathbb{R}_+$ and, then, Chernoff's inequality provides

$$\frac{1}{t^{2\kappa-1}}\log P\big(\langle\!\langle X_t,\Upsilon X_t\rangle\!\rangle>t^{\kappa}\varepsilon\big)\le -\lambda t^{1-\kappa}\varepsilon+\frac{\log Ee^{\lambda\langle\!\langle X_t,\Upsilon X_t\rangle\!\rangle}}{t^{2\kappa-1}}\xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{}-\infty.$$

(ii) is valid if

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\Big(\Big|\int_0^t\Big[\langle\!\langle X_s,\Upsilon BB^*\Upsilon X_s\rangle\!\rangle-\mathrm{trace}(\mathsf{D})\Big]ds\Big|>t\varepsilon\Big)=-\infty. \tag{4.11}$$

Let us denote $\gamma=\Upsilon BB^*\Upsilon$ and $\mathfrak{h}(x)=\langle\!\langle x,\gamma x\rangle\!\rangle-\mathrm{trace}(\mathsf{D})$. We repeat the previous arguments to find $\mathfrak{u}(x)=\langle\!\langle x,\mathfrak{r}x\rangle\!\rangle-r$ with a positive definite matrix $\mathfrak{r}$ and positive number $r$ such that $\mathfrak{m}_t=\mathfrak{u}(X_t)-\mathfrak{u}(x)+\int_0^t\mathfrak{h}(X_s)ds$ is a continuous martingale with $\langle\mathfrak{m}\rangle_t=\int_0^t\langle\!\langle X_s,\mathfrak{q}X_s\rangle\!\rangle ds$, where $\mathfrak{q}$ is a positive definite matrix. Now, we may replace (4.11) by

$$\begin{aligned}&(1)\ \lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\big(\langle\!\langle X_t,\gamma X_t\rangle\!\rangle>t\varepsilon\big)=-\infty\\ &(2)\ \lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\big(\big|\mathfrak{m}_t\big|>t\varepsilon\big)=-\infty.\end{aligned}$$

(1) is verified similarly to (i). (2) is verified with the help of Theorem A.2 by showing $\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\big(\langle\mathfrak{m}\rangle_t>tn\big)=-\infty$ for sufficiently large $n$ what is nothing but

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\Big(\int_0^t\langle\!\langle X_s,\mathfrak{q}X_s\rangle\!\rangle ds>tn\Big)=-\infty. \tag{4.12}$$

A version of (4.12) with $\mathfrak{q}$ replaced by any positive definite matrix $G$ provides (4.12) too. For computational convenience, we take $G$ solving Lyapunov's equation $A^*G+GA+\mathrm{I}=0$. The function $V(x)=\langle\!\langle x,Gx\rangle\!\rangle$ belongs to the range of definition of $\mathscr{L}$ with $\mathscr{L}V(x)=-2\|x\|^2+\mathrm{trace}(BPB^*)\le -cV(x)+\mathfrak{c}$ and

$$N_t=V(X_t)-V(x)-\int_0^t\mathscr{L}V(X_s)ds=\int_0^t 2\langle\!\langle X_s,BdW_s\rangle\!\rangle,$$

so that, $\langle N\rangle_t\le\int_0^t\mathbf{c}V(X_s)ds$.

Thus, the proof is completed by applying Theorem A.1. □

## 5. Example of statistical application

Let $X_t$ ($\in\mathbb{R}$) be a diffusion process: $dX_t=-\theta X_tdt+dW_t$, subject to a fixed $X_0$. The parameter $\theta\in(0,\infty)$ is unknown and is evaluated with help of well known estimate

$$\widehat{\theta}_t=\frac{\int_0^tX_sdX_s}{\int_0^tX_s^2ds},\ t>0.$$

It is well known that the CLT holds for the family $\big(\sqrt{t}(\theta-\widehat{\theta}_t)\big)_{t\to\infty}$ with a limit: zero mean Gaussian random variable with the variance $2\theta$.

In this section, we show that $\theta-\widehat{\theta}_t$ possesses an asymptotic (in $t\to\infty$) in the MDP scale, $\frac12<\kappa<1$, that is, the family $\big(t^{1-\kappa}(\theta-\widehat{\theta}_t)\big)_{t\to\infty}$ obeys $(\varrho,J)$-MDP with $J(Y)=\frac{Y^2}{4\theta}$. The use of some details from the proof of Theorem 3.4 enables to claim that $\big(\frac1t\int_0^t[X_s^2-\frac{1}{2\theta}]ds)_{t\to\infty}$ is negligible in $\varrho$-MDP scale. Therefore, the family $\big(t^{1-\kappa}(\theta-\widehat{\theta}_t)\big)_{t\to\infty}$ shares the MDP with $\big(\frac{1}{t^{\kappa}}\int_0^t2\theta X_sdW_s\big)_{t\to\infty}$. Further, the announced MDP hold if (ii) from Theorem 2.1 is valid:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\log\varrho(t)P\Big(\Big|\int_0^t[4\theta^2X_s^2-Q]ds\Big|>t\varepsilon\Big)=-\infty. \tag{5.1}$$

Obviously, $Q = 2\theta$ and the validity of (5.1) is verified with the help of arguments used in the proof of Theorem 3.4.

In particular, this MDP and the contraction Varadhan's principle, for sufficiently large $t$ provide

$$\frac{1}{t^{2\kappa-1}} \log P\big(t^{1-\kappa}|\theta - \widehat{\theta}_t| > \delta\big) \asymp -\frac{\delta^2}{4\theta}.$$

## Appendix A. Exponential negligibility of functionals and martingales

Let $X_t$ be a diffusion process defined in (1.2) with $X_0 = x$.

Assume $V(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$, with $\lim_{\|x\|\to\infty} V(x) = \infty$, belongs to the range of definition of $\mathscr{L}$. Introduce a martingale relative to $(\mathscr{F})_{t\ge 0}$:

$$N_t = V(X_t) - V(x) - \int_0^t \mathscr{L}V(X_s)ds. \tag{A.1}$$

**Theorem A.1.** *Assume*

1) $\mathscr{L}V \le -cV^\ell + \mathfrak{c}$, $\exists\ \ell > 0$

2) $\langle N\rangle_t \le \int_0^t \mathbf{c}\big(1 + V^r(X_s)\big)ds$, $\exists\ r \le \ell$.

*Then, for any* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and sufficiently large number* $n$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(V(X_t) > t^{2\kappa}\varepsilon\big) = -\infty,$$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\Big(\int_0^t V^\ell(X_s)ds > tn\Big) = -\infty.$$

*over* $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

**Corollary 1.** $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(V(X_t) > t^2\varepsilon\big) = -\infty$, *since* $t^2 > t^{2\kappa}, t > 1$.

**Remark 2.** *The statements of Theorem A.1 remain valid if constants* $c, \mathfrak{c}, \mathbf{c}$, *involved in* 1) *and* 2) *depend on* $\varepsilon$.

**Theorem A.2.** *Let* $M_t(\in \mathbb{R}, M_0 = 0)$ *be a continuous martingale.*

*Then, for any* $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(|M_t| > t\varepsilon\big) = -\infty$$

*provided that, under sufficiently large number* $n$ *depending on* $\varepsilon$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) \log P\big(\langle M\rangle_t > tn\big) = -\infty.$$

*The proof of Theorem A.1.* With $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and the (continuous) martingale $N_t$ from (A.1), we introduce a positive random process $\mathfrak{z}_t(\lambda) = e^{\lambda N_t - 0.5\lambda^2\langle N\rangle_t}$. It is well known and easily verified with the help of Itô's formula that $(\mathfrak{z}_t(\lambda), \mathscr{F}^X_t)_{t\ge 0}$ is a positive local martingale. Moreover, by Problem 1.4.4, [16], it is a supermartingale too. We shall use the supermartingale property: $E\mathfrak{z}_t(\lambda) \le E\mathfrak{z}_0(\lambda) \equiv 1$ over $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Denote by

$$\mathfrak{A}_1 = \{V(X_t) > t^{2\kappa}\varepsilon\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{A}_2 = \Big\{\int_0^t V^r(X_s)ds > tn\Big\}.$$

The use of $E\mathfrak{z}_t(\lambda) \le 1$ provides

$$1 \ge EI_{\mathfrak{A}_i}\mathfrak{z}_t(\lambda), \quad i = 1, 2 \tag{A.2}$$

Notice that (A.2) remains valid with $\mathfrak{z}_t(\lambda)$ replaced by its lower bound on $\mathfrak{A}_i$. We proceed the proof by finding appropriate deterministic (!) lower bounds. Write

$$\lambda N_t - 0.5\lambda^2\langle N\rangle_t = \lambda\Big(V(X_t) - V(x) - \int_0^t \mathscr{L}V(X_s)ds\Big) - 0.5\lambda^2\langle N\rangle_t.$$

Thence, in view of 1) and 2), with $\lambda > 0$ we get

$$\lambda N_t - 0.5\lambda^2\langle N\rangle_t \ge \lambda\Big(V(X_t) - V(x) + \int_0^t [cV^\ell(X_s) - \mathfrak{c}]ds\Big) \\ - 0.5\lambda^2\int_0^t \mathbf{c}(1 + V^r(X_s))ds.$$

Taking into account $1 + V^r(X_s) \le 2 + V^\ell(X_s)$, provided by $r \le \ell$, and choosing $\lambda^\circ = \operatorname{argmax}_{\lambda>0}\big[c\lambda - 0.5\mathbf{c}\lambda^2\big] = \frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}$, we get

$$\lambda^\circ N_t - 0.5(\lambda^\circ)^2\langle N\rangle_t \ge \frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}\big[V(X_t) - V(x)\big] - t\frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}\big[\mathfrak{c} + c\big] + \frac{c^2}{2\mathbf{c}}\int_0^t V^\ell(X_s)ds \\ \ge \begin{cases} \frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}\big[t^{2\kappa}\varepsilon - V(x)\big] - t\frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}\big[\mathfrak{c} + c\big], & \text{over } \mathfrak{A}_1, \\ -\frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}V(x) - t\frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}\big[\mathfrak{c} + c\big] + \frac{c^2}{2\mathbf{c}}tn, & \text{over } \mathfrak{A}_2. \end{cases}$$

These lower bounds jointly with (A.2) provide

$$\left.\begin{array}{ll} \varrho(t)\log P\big(\mathfrak{A}_1\big) \le -\frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}\Big[t\varepsilon - \frac{V(x)}{t^{2\kappa-1}}\Big] + t^{2(1-\kappa)}\frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}\big[\mathfrak{c} + c\big], & \text{over } \mathfrak{A}_1 \\ \varrho(t)\log P\big(\mathfrak{A}_2\big) \le \frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}\frac{V(x)}{t^{2\kappa-1}} + t^{2(1-\kappa)}\frac{c}{\mathbf{c}}\big[\mathfrak{c} + c\big] - t^{2(1-\kappa)}\frac{c^2}{2\mathbf{c}}n, & \text{over } \mathfrak{A}_2 \end{array}\right\} \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{} -\infty.$$

□

*The proof of Theorem A.2.* Notice that only

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\big(|M_t| > t\varepsilon, \langle M\rangle_t \le tn\big) = -\infty \tag{A.3}$$

is required to be proved. Moreover, it suffices to prove only

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t)\log P\big(M_t > t\varepsilon, \langle M\rangle_t \le tn\big) = -\infty \tag{A.4}$$

owing to a version with $-M_t$ is verified similarly and both "$\pm M_t$" provide (A.3).

For (A.4) verification, we use the inequality from (A.2) with $\lambda > 0$ and $N_t$, $\langle N\rangle_t$ replaced by $M_t$, $\langle M\rangle_t$ respectively and $\mathfrak{A}_i$ replaced by

$$\mathfrak{A} = \{M_t > t\varepsilon, \langle M\rangle_t \le tn\}$$

and notice that

$$\log\mathfrak{z}_t(\lambda) = \lambda M_t - 0.5\lambda^2\langle M\rangle_t \underbrace{\ge}_{\text{over }\mathfrak{A}} \lambda t\varepsilon - 0.5\lambda^2 tn \ge \min_{\lambda>0}(\lambda t\varepsilon - 0.5\lambda^2 tn) = t\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2n}.$$

Then, owing to $1 \ge e^{t\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2n}}EI_{\mathfrak{A}}$, we get $\varrho(t)\log P\big(\mathfrak{A}\big) \le -t^{2(1-\kappa)}\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2n} \to -\infty$. □

## REFERENCES

[1] Albert, A. (1972) *Regression and the Moore-Penrose Pseudoinverse.* Academic Press, New York and London.

[2] Bayer, U., Freidlin, M.I. (1977) Theorems on large deviations and stability under random perturbations" *DAN USSR.* **235**, 2, pp. 253-256.

[3] Bhattacharya, R.N. (1992) On the functional central limit theorem and the law of the iterated logarithm for Markov processes, Z. Wharsch. verw. Geb. **60**, pp. 185–201.

[4] Delyon, B., Juditsky, A. and Liptser, R. (2005) Moderate deviation principle for ergodic Markov chain. Lipschitz summands *Shiryev's Festschrift.*

[5] Dembo, A. (1996) Moderate deviations for martingales with bounded jumps,*Elect. Comm. in Probab.* **1**, pp. 11-17.

[6] Down, D., Meyn, S.P. and Tweedie, R.L. (1995) Exponential and uniform ergodicity of Markov processes. Ann. Probab. 23, no. 4, pp. 1671-1691.

[7] Ethier, S.N., Kurtz, T.G. (1986), *Markov processes. Characterization and convergence*, Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, New York et al.

[8] Gong, F. and Wu, L. (2000) Spectral gap of positive operators and applications, *C. R. Acad. Sci.*, Ser. I, Math. **331**(12), pp. 983-988.

[9] Guillin, A. (2001) Moderate deviations of inhomogeneous functionals of Markov processes and application to averaging. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **92**, pp. 287-313.

[10] Guillin, A. (2003) Averaging of SDE with small diffusions: Moderate deviations. *Ann. Prob.*, Vol. 31(1), pp. 413-443.

[11] Inglot, T. and Kallenberg, C.M. (2000) Moderate Deviations of Minimum Contrast Estimators under Contamination. *Preprint.*

[12] Kalman, R.E. (1960) Contribution in the theory of optimal control. Bol. Soc. Mat. Mex., **5**, pp. 102-119.

[13] Krylov, N.V. (1980) *Controlled diffusion processes.* Springer, (in Russian, Moscow, 1977).

[14] Khasminskii, R.Z. (1980). *Stochastic stability of differential equations.* Sijthoff & Noordhoff.

[15] Ladyzenskaja, O., Solonnikov, V., Ural'ceva, N. (1968) *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type.* Translation Monographs, **23**, AMS, Provvidence.

[16] Liptser, R.Sh. and Shiryayev, A.N. (1989) *Theory of Martingales.* Kluwer Acad. Publ.

[17] Mattingly, J. C. and Stuart, A. M., (2002) Geometric ergodicity of some hypo-elliptic diffusions for particle motions, Markov Process. Related Fields, vol. 8 no. 2 , pp. 199–214 (Inhomogeneous random systems (Cergy-Pontoise, 2001)

[18] Mattingly, J. C., Stuart, A. M. and Higham, D. J. (2002) Ergodicity for SDEs and approximations: locally Lipschitz vector fields and degenerate noise, Stochastic Process. Appl., vol. 101 no., pp. 185–232.

[19] Meyn, S.P.and Tweedie, R.L. (1993) *Markov chains and stochastic stability.* Springer-Verlag.

[20] Papanicolaou, C.C., Stroock, D.W., Varahan, S.R.S. (1977) Martingale approach to some limit theorems. in: *Conference on Statistical Mechanics, Dinamical Systems and Turbulence*, M. Reed ed., Duke Univ. Math. Series, **3**.

[21] Pardoux, E., Veretennikov, A.Yu. (2001) *On Poisson equation and diffusion approximation, 1.* Ann. Prob. **29** (2001), n. 3, pp. 1061-1085.

[22] Pardoux, E., Veretennikov, A.Yu. (2003) *On Poisson equation and diffusion approximation, 2.* Ann. Prob. **31** , n. 3, pp. 1166-1192.

[23] Puhalskii, A.A. (1991) On functional principle of large deviations". *New trends in Probability and Statistics., Vilnius, Lithuania, VSP/Mokslas*, pp. 198-218.

[24] Puhalskii, A.A. (1994) The method of stochastic exponentials for large deviations. *Stochast. Proc. Appl.* **54**, , pp. 45-70.

[25] Puhalskii, A. (1999) Large deviations of semimartingales: a maxingale problem approach. II. Uniqueness for the maxingale problem. Applications. *Stoch. Stoch. Rep.*, **68**, pp. 65-143.

[26] Puhalskii, A. (2001) Large Deviations and Idempotent Probability, Chapman & Hall/CRC Press.

[27] Varadhan, S.R.S. (1984) *Large Deviations and Applications.* SIAM, Philadelphia.

[28] Veretennikov, A.Yu. (1999), On polynomial mixing and convergence rate for stochastic difference and differential equations. *Teoria veroyatnostej i ee primeneniya.* **44**, 2, pp. 312–327 (in Russian; English version: preprint 393 (1998), WIAS, Berlin).

[29] Wu, L. (1995) Moderate deviations of dependent random variables related to CLT and LIL, *Annals of Probability.* **23**, no. 1, pp. 420-445.

[30] Wu, L. (2000) Uniformly integrable operators and large deviations for Markov processes, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **172**(2), pp. 301-376.

[31] Wu, L. (2000) Some notes on large deviations of Markov processes, *Acta Math. Sin., Engl. Ser.*, **16**(3), pp. 369-394.

[32] Wu, L. (2001) The principle of large deviations for empirical processes, *J. Math., Wuhan Univ.*, **21**(3), pp. 295-300.

[33] Wu, L. (20001) Large and moderate deviations and exponential convergence for stochastic damping Hamiltonian systems. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications.* **91**, pp. 205-238.

CEREMADE, Université Paris Dauphine and TSI, Ecole nationale des Telecommunications
*E-mail address*: `guillin@ceremade.dauphine.fr`

Electrical Engineering Systems, Tel Aviv University, 69978 - Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv, Israel
*E-mail address*: `liptser@eng.tau.ac.il`